

beginning. Once fairly started on this road, there will be no stopping. Militarism never was satisfied; it never will be satisfied. It is always reaching out for more, always sighing, with an Alexander, for new worlds to conquer, always lamenting, with a Roosevelt, that there is not war enough to go around. If we yield now to those who would commit us to a policy strange to our ideals and incompatible with our liberties, does anyone lay the flattering unction to his soul that these ideals and these liberties will survive a contact so baneful?

There is a subtle poison in this preparedness which is breaking down the fabric of our thought and eating out the very vitals of our national spirit. In what terms are we thinking today? Not in terms of peace, not in terms of brotherhood, not in terms of international amity, not in terms of good will and justice, not in terms of charity and forbearance, not in terms of patience and generous allowance. Nay. It is in quite other terms—in terms of force, in terms of suspicion, in terms of jealousy, in terms of rancor and prejudice and ill will, in terms that make for misunderstandings and bitterness, in terms rankling with the acrid venom of hatred and shot through with the deadly distillations of unreasoning passion. This may sound like empty rhetoric. But is it? Read the daily press. Listen to the fulminations from pulpit and platform where jingoism finds voice. Dip into the literature of the hour. Mingle with those who catch their inspiration from the patriots for profit. If you do not in all these find proof of what is here said, then you are capable of making interpretations which are clearly denied to me.

IN DANGER FROM NO QUARTER

Mr. Chairman, of whom are we afraid? Who is offering us any affront? Who is coveting our territory? Who is threatening our institutions? I do not forget, nor have you forgotten, that the President of the United States himself has declared that we are in danger from no quarter. Yet we are asked to prepare and very adequately prepare. For what? Against whom? On what account? Who has answered or even attempted to answer these very pertinent questions? Who indeed. There is no answer to them. To attempt to answer them is to render absurd all the hysterical talk with which the country has been deluged during recent months. We are to be attacked and overwhelmed by some unnamed power when the European war is brought to an end. That is one of the answers. But every power in Europe will be exhausted when the war is over. All Europe even now is on the verge of exhaustion. Both in men and in resources the nations now at death grips are nearing the point of collapse. Yet we are asked to believe that when this tremendous struggle is brought to a close through exhaustion—and it will scarcely close short of that—one of the nations, or perhaps a combination of them, will turn at once upon us to recoup the losses that war has entailed. Could absurdity go further? Could rational minds be more grossly insulted than they are when talk of this sort is addressed to them in support of a policy otherwise without support? For there is no support for the policy except this irrational and fantastic conjuring with the possible.

Of course it is possible for Germany and Russia to combine against us when this war is over. Equally, of course, it is possible for Britain and Austria to do so. It were even possible for all the nations now at war to forget their hatreds and their jealousies and their mutual scars and to make common cause against the United States. But we are not dealing with possibilities in this world of cause and effect. We are dealing, rather, with probabilities, with reasonable sequences and consequences, with logic rather than with dreams, with facts rather than with unbridled fancies. While it may be granted that there are many possible contingencies growing out of or merely following the great war, where is the human probability that any exhausted nation or any conceivable combination of exhausted nations will thirst for more blood and seek to slake their thirst at an American fountain?

Some of us in this crisis of the republic find ourselves most unhappily out of touch with leaders we have hitherto followed unflinchingly and with glad steps. It is a grief to us that a difference of opinion has resulted in a momentary divergence of our paths. But here I am reminded of something written by Thomas Jefferson a long time ago. It seems to fit a situation which faces us today as it fitted the situation which he had in mind.

"During the throes and convulsions of the

ancient world," he wrote, "during the agonizing spasms of infuriated man, seeking through blood and slaughter his long-lost liberty, it was not wonderful that the agitation of the billows should reach even this distant shore; that this should be more felt and feared by some and less by others; and should divide opinion as to measures of safety. But every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. Error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left to combat it."

And it is to reason that we who stand for peace are appealing today. We are not questioning the patriotism of most of those who differ with us in this hour of stress. We believe them, or most of them, actuated by motives as high and as unselfish as our own; but we honestly and most sincerely question the wisdom of the method they have chosen in dealing with a great and momentous occasion. The United States has been mightily stirred by the awful conflict raging across the Atlantic. Nearly all of us have kin over there. No home is bereft there without a shadow falling across the threshold of a home in this haven of the oppressed.

The agitation of the billows of the Baltic and the North Sea has reached even this distant and peaceful shore and many emotions in American breasts have been the response—emotions of fear, emotions of sympathy, emotions of hatred, emotions of suspicion, emotions of sheer selfishness and greed. And out of these emotions have come many and varied differences of opinion. Some of us have been concerned with respect to our own safety. These have feared that out of the blood and fury of the mighty conflict in which Europe is weltering may come a fearful danger to our own land and our own institutions. And this fear has been played upon magically by some who nurse ambitions and by others who harbor sordid desires, and by still others who cherish race prejudices or national bigotries—all together conspiring, perhaps unconsciously, to bring about a state of the public mind which tends to find expression in terms of force, in battleships and air craft, in submarines and long-range guns, in shrapnel and men in khaki.

But happily reason is left to combat errors of opinion which may have obtained in connection with the great conflagration which has touched us with its searing tongues. We are not bound to accept the word of authority. Each of us is free to exercise his own judgment, to follow his own conscience, to consult his own convictions. Are we in danger? If so, there is no American unready to meet it, none who would pause to count the cost involved in meeting it. We have been told and repeatedly told, that we are not threatened from without. But are we threatened from within? If so, will continentals and warships avert the danger? May they not indeed enhance it? Revolutions are not stopped by armed men. But a thousand revolutions might have been averted by turning swords into plowshares and soldiers into husbandmen. If we are endangered from within, the situation is to be met, not by building battle fleets and planting our harbors with mines; it is not to be averted by turning the republic into a military camp; it is not to be disposed of by levying fresh taxes on the toilers of the land; it is to be dealt with successfully only by removing the causes which produce unrest and uprooting the injustices which provoke resentment and incite bitterness of class feeling.

AN EXAMPLE OF NOBLE MORALITY

May I not, in conclusion, appeal to reason and to common sense in the consideration of this vital issue? The poison of preparedness has undeniably crept subtly through our whole system of thought and national effort. It has brought a sort of madness upon many minds. It has obsessed thousands with the dread of some awful consequence to ourselves of the European struggle. Yet what I contend, to paraphrase the language of the great Richard Cobden, is that America is today so situated in every particular of her domestic and foreign circumstances that by leaving other governments to settle their own business and fight out their own quarrels and by attending to the vast and difficult affairs of her own enormous realm and the condition of her own people she will not only be setting the world an example of noble morality—which no other nation is so happily free to set—but she will be following the very course which the maintenance of her own greatness most imperatively demands. It is precisely because America is so strong in resources, in courage, in institutions, in geographical position,

that she can, before all other powers, afford to be moral and to set the example of a mighty nation walking the paths of justice and of peace. (Applause.)

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks in the Record.

A Voice from the Past

John Bright, one the great British statesmen of the last century, was a democrat and an anti-militarist. His speeches are worth reading in connection with the discussion of preparedness.

He was also a friend of the United States and frequently cited this nation as worthy of emulation. On October 10, 1860, for instance, in complaining of the expenditure of England and France on preparedness, he said:

"I see no end to it. The greatest mechanical intellects of our time are absorbed in the question how to complete instruments of defence and destruction, and there seems to be no limit to their discoveries and projects, so long as France and England shall lead in great armaments and in the attempt to dominate over the world. What a glorious isolation is that of the United States. Until we adopt their principle, I see no security for peace for us or for Europe—for until then, every disturbance in Europe is made the pretext for a greater expenditure here, and we are constantly in a state of preparation to plunge into the chaos of any continental entanglement."

In January, 1861, Bright wrote Gladstone urging that Great Britain and France enter into an agreement regulating navy armaments. He calculated that "at least fifteen millions a year might be saved to the two countries at once by such an arrangement as I speak of, besides the increasing peril of war from these frightful preparations, and this incessant military excitement."

Sixty-five years ago Bright saw that the "frightful preparation" and the "incessant military excitement" necessarily involved in the program of the militarists would make war more probable.

Disraeli at that time advocated a reduction of naval expenditures by an understanding with France as to the relative size of the two navies. As early as 1849 France had offered to join Great Britain in a movement to reduce armaments, but Lord Palmerston, the most outspoken jingo of that day, declined the offer.

W. J. BRYAN.

AS TO MANUSCRIPTS

1. Never send a manuscript to a busy man without first asking whether he is in position to examine it.
2. Never send a manuscript to any one unless it is TYPEWRITTEN.
3. Never send a manuscript to any one without keeping a copy—there is always danger of its being lost.

Secrecy of plans has been thrown to the winds and Mr. Roosevelt is avowedly in full cry after the republican nomination. The remarkable situation of the republican party is no better illustrated than in the fact that the tariff barons, in their extremity, are turning, to save the party from continued defeat, to the man who dynamited it but four years ago.

PATRIOTISM

Patriotism is unselfishness measured in terms of national service; it is love of country manifested by action. As one feels it his duty to render assistance to those related to him by ties of friendship or neighborhood, so he feels it his duty to serve not only those joined to him by the ties which bind together the citizens of a nation, but future generations.

The sentiment is unselfish in that the citizen does not, when called upon for service, stop to calculate how or when the aid which he renders others will bring benefit to himself. And yet, the intelligent citizen knows that God has so linked us to others that any legitimate advancement made by one contributes indirectly, if not directly, to the welfare of all, and that all, therefore, are concerned in any injury that comes to one of the number.

It is hardly necessary to add that patriotism is a virtue which manifests itself in time of peace as well as in time of war—it is a flower that blooms not merely on the battlefield but whenever and wherever sacrifice for country is required.

W. J. BRYAN.